

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/047,710	Applicant(s) CHAKRABARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner MISOOK YU, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1642	

All Participants:

(1) MISOOK YU, Ph.D.

(2) Dr. John Murray.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 30 December 2004
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:


Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 12-30-04

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative was told that the new base claim 40, and the dependent claims 41-48 do not belong to the elected invention, which comprises method of administering to a patient as the active step. Dr. Murray wanted to receive another restriction instead of agreeing for claims 41-48 being withdrawn from examination on merits.